



### *Sheviocck Parish Council*

The Bill Warren Room, Sheviocck Memorial Hall, Craffhole, Torpoint, Cornwall, PL11 3DG  
 Clerk: Mrs Nancy Gray. Telephone: 01503 232996 Email: [sheviocckpc@btinternet.com](mailto:sheviocckpc@btinternet.com)

## **The Minutes of the Sheviocck Parish Council, Special Planning Meeting, held on Monday the 27<sup>th</sup> of Jan 2020 in the Schoolroom, Craffhole Methodist Chapel, Craffhole, commencing at 7:00pm.**

Present: Councillors: Chair Cllr Steve Medway. Vice Chair Cllr P Brooks. Cllrs: W Evans, L Jenkins Parish Clerk Mrs N. Gray.

There were 6 members of the Public present.

### **MINUTES**

#### **1. APOLOGIES. Cllrs Lester and Pine.**

- 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS. 1 AGENDA ITEMS.** Cllr Cade had expressed and circulated in writing a predetermined and continuing objection to policy 1 of The Rame NDP. Therefore under the Code of conduct guidelines he agreed not sit on the Parish Council for the meeting, as the variation of condition 3 of the planning application, concerned Policy 1 of the Rame NDP. He therefore was able to express his opinion during Public Participation, as a parishioner. Cllr Cade has yet been unable to attend a Code of conduct Course, as he is new to the role, this will be organised by the Clerk. **2 GIFTS** (All gifts and hospitality received that could be seen by the public as likely to influence a Councillor's judgement) None.

#### **3. CONSIDERATION OF WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS. None.**

#### **4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**

- A letter of Objection to the variation of condition 3, from parishioner Mrs G Kennedy was read out, as per her request. Highlighting the following concerns . Approx. 60% of the houses in Portwrinkle are second homes/holiday lets. Second home ownership is often seen as an investment and this pushes prices in the area higher, out of reach of the lower income local families. Second homes also create a ghost town out of season causing a drop in income for local shops and pubs etc. The owners of primary residences are more committed to the area in which they live; involving themselves in schools, shops and village activities. The plan took 3 years to produce in conjunction with St John, Maker with Rame, Antony and Millbrook. and the main decision was to make all new build homes in the area primary residences. This was supported by a referendum passed overwhelmingly in favour of the plan.
- Mr P Cade supported the variation to the condition. Points raised included that: The Rame NDP policy 1 allows existing non holiday usage private dwellings to be used for holiday lets, yet prevents a property that was used as holiday accommodation to be continued as such. Usage for holiday lets will add to the local economy and preserve an iconic listed building. It could add to the available housing still, taking the pressure of the existing housing which is being converted for holiday lets and instead re-use existing holiday accommodation.
- Mr P Phillips of the Whitsand Bay Hotel supported the variation. Points raised included: The Rame NDP was not intended for the conversion of a listed building hotel. With the Cil (Levey) no new homes have been built under this policy. If all accommodation was sold as primary residences, he did not believe the new owners would wish to allow local public access to the pool/leisure facilities. Would a planner consider positioning 18 permanent residences amongst the holiday style village currently being built around it? Would private residents wish to live amongst holiday accommodation? The Golf Course relies on visitors for trade.
- Mr J Phillips of the Whitsand Bay Hotel, supported the variation Points raised included: The policy does not fit with a listed building, there is a duty of care to ensure this iconic listed building does not fall beyond the point of no viable financial return, and fall derelict. If writing the RNDP now would it take into special account akin to areas highlighted in the RNDP i.e. Maker Heights, the Listed building of Whitsand Bay hotel. They have been unable to sell it with this condition.

#### **5. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**

The chair responded to some of the points as follows:

This application is taking into account 18 new residences not just one.

The RNDP was not asked to take into account the Whitsand Bay Hotel, during the planning of the Rame NDP.

## 6. PLANNING.

### **To review the Parish Council's response, as consultees, to planning application: PA19/09480**

Proposal Change of Use of current Hotel (C1 use) for the creation of eighteen one and two bedroom apartments (C3 use), gym, hair salon, games room and pool with associated alterations to a Listed Building (Grade II) with variation of condition 3 of application no. PA18/08163 dated 10/04/19 Location Whitsand Bay Hotel Finnygook Lane Portwrinkle PL11 3BU Applicant Mr & Mrs C. J. And J. M Phillip.

The chair summarised the events that led to this Special Planning meeting:

*The original application was supported by Sheviocck Parish Council, with the following condition:*

*If change of use is allowed, the proposed development indicates that 1 x one bedroom and 17 x two-bedroom apartments would be created for open market sale.*

*Under Policy 1 of the Rame NDP, these must be for local people as their principal residence and could not be second homes.*

*In addition, under Policy 6 of the Cornwall Local plan, 'Housing mix', such a development should 'address the needs for affordable, market and starter homes' and under Policy 8, Cornwall Local plan, all new housing schemes 'must contribute to meeting affordable housing needs'. Sheviocck Parish has been allocated the second highest proportion of affordable home requirement within the county, reflecting its need for affordable homes, and this means that 7 or 8 of the 18 new builds should be affordable housing and 5 or 6 should be for rent. There must be a clear condition applied by Cornwall Council to ensure these affordable homes are provided.*

*The applicants made a new application requesting the removal of the condition, Condition 3*

*The SPC objected to this application citing the requirements of the NDP.*

*The council also recognised the fact that the NDP was voted for by an overwhelming majority of parishioners, who wanted the imposition of the primary residence clause.*

*It was further recognised that to rescind that agreement would require another consultation of the five parishes and for them to vote against it.*

*The Philips and their agent attended the SPC October meeting and stated that they had been advised to consult the SPC with a view to changing its decision. When I re-read the application PA19/09480 to lift the condition in preparation for the meeting, the Supporting Statement wording:*

*"Mr John Phillips, co-owner of the Hotel, spoke to Mr Trubody who was understanding, but suggested that we revert to the Case Officer to see if there is any room for manoeuvre within the wording of the existing condition.*

*In speaking further to James Hills (who has been actively involved in the many other adjacent developments within Portwrinkle for a number of years) it was suggested that we either submit a pre-application enquiry or lodge a formal Section 73 application so that the removal or variation of Condition 3 could be properly considered by the appropriate authorities. He did however also recommend that either option would be best received with the support of the Parish and to this end we attended the Council meeting on 14th October. "*

*This seemed to me to be an unfair weighting of responsibility by the authorities onto the Parish Council, and contrary to our understanding of the stipulation of the NDP.*

*The applicants had evidently made the same interpretation. So, they then attended the council meeting with the impression that the SPC were the only stumbling block to their aspirations, and that a refusal of permission could be seen as purely the result of our stance.*

*We therefore agreed to the Philip's plea to review our decision at another meeting, at which the decision would be re considered.*

*I have since spoken with members of Cornwall Council seeking procedural clarification-, I cited the Supporting Statement and its inference that there was scope for manoeuvre subject to SPCs decision. It may well be that the info within the Statement, authored by their agent, was somewhat open to interpretation of what had passed"*

The Chair summarised the options available:

- 1/ Support the variation/removal of condition3
- 2/ Object to the variation/removal of condition3removal of the condition
- 3/ No comment on the variation/removal of condition 3.

Cllr Evans stated that he had asked approx. 30 parishioners, none of whom had voted in the Rame NDP referendum. Comments included that it would be a reduction in holiday Accommodation from 36 to 18, it wasn't viewed as a new Build, and there was a wish for the building to be maintained.

Cllrs Brooks and Jenkins both empathised with the situation that the Phillips family found themselves in and also did not wish to see the building become derelict but did not wish to go against the Rame NDP and policy as voted for in a democratic referendum within the parish and Rame Peninsula.

With one in support of the variation and 3 voting for a no Comment response to be submitted.  
**The Parish Council resolved to submit a response of: No comment to the variation/removal of condition.**

**The chair closed the meeting at 19:37**

**Nancy Gray, Parish Clerk**  
**Clerk's Office, Sheviock Memorial Hall, Craffhole, PL11 3DG**  
**Telephone: 01503 232996 Email: [sheviockpc@btinternet.com](mailto:sheviockpc@btinternet.com)**

This meeting is advertised as a public meeting and as such could be filmed or recorded by broadcasters, the media and members of the public. Please be aware that whilst every effort is taken to ensure that members of the public are not filmed, **we cannot guarantee this**, especially if you are speaking or taking an active role.